7th January 1950]

Smuggling of cholam in the Kurnool district.

* 95 Q.—SRI N. SANKARA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Food be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Deputy Commercial Tax Officer, Kurnool, had detected smuggling of 23 bags of cholam from Kurnool to Peapalli on 17th and 21st September 1948;

(b) whether the Commercial Tax Officer had made any recommendations and, if so, what they are;

(c) whether it is a fact that the Collector had sanctioned prosecution in R.C.G-3-15146/48, dated 1st December 1948;

(d) whether that order was given effect to and if not, why not; and

(e) who the owner of the seized property is?

THE HON. SRI J. L. P. ROCHE VICTORIA:—"(a) No: but what he detected was a case of stocking of 20 bags of cholam for sale without a licence.

"(b) Yes. He recommended prosecution.

"(c) Yes. The prosecution was sanctioned in his R.C.G. 3-13649/48, dated 1st December 1948, and not in R.C.G. 3-15146/48, dated 1st December 1948.

"(d) Yes.

"(e) Does not arise as no property was seized."

DR. V. K. JOHN:—"What is the result of the prosecution ordered in 1948?"

THE HON. SRI J. L. P. ROCHE VICTORIA:—"No information, Sir."

SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—"Is it not a fact that these bags were caught in a lorry, Sir?"

THE HON. SRI J. L. P. ROCHE VICTORIA:—"It is not clear whether they were caught in a lorry or from a place where they were stocked."

SRI R. SURYANARAYANA RAO:—"Will the Hon. Minister at least see that the order is not withdrawn?"

THE HON. SRI J. L. P. ROCHE VICTORIA:—"I have already stated that a prosecution has been ordered."

SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—"What was the result?"

THE HON. SRI J. L. P. ROCHE VICTORIA:—"No information, Sir.

SRI P. R. K. SARMA:—"May I ask whether the Government will call for information?"

[7th January 1950

THE HON. SRI J. L. P. ROCHE VICTORIA :—" The prosecution is still going on. In the circumstances no further information need be called for."

SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—" May I know whether an explanation will be called for from the officer concerned for not giving effect to the orders of prosecution ? "

THE HON. SRI J. L. P. ROCHE VICTORIA :—" When we receive the final report, we will deal with the persons concerned."

[*Note.*—**An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.**]

II.—ADJOURNMENT MOTION.

FAILURE OF THE GOVERNMENT TO CONSULT THE COUNCIL ON THE FORMATION OF ANDHRA PROVINCE.

MR. PRESIDENT :—" What has the Leader of the House to say about the adjournment motion ? "

THE HON. DR. T. S. S. RAJAN :—" I want to know whether the hon. Member is going to move his motion."

MR. PRESIDENT :—" I want to know the views of the Leader of the House. Regarding the hon. Member's moving the motion, I must give him permission. But before I give him the formal permission, I would like to know the views of the Leader of the House."

THE HON. DR. T. S. S. RAJAN :—" He may move his adjournment motion, Sir."

MR. PRESIDENT :—" The procedure is this. If an hon. Member brings it to my notice that he intends to move an adjournment motion, I must first see whether it is in order. In this particular case, *prima facie* it looks to be in order. I want to know whether you are opposing this motion or not. After knowing that I want to take the sense of the House."

THE HON. DR. T. S. S. RAJAN :—" I am opposing the motion, Sir."

MR. PRESIDENT :—" I have received notice of the following adjournment motion :—

' The definite matter of urgent public importance referred to is—

The failure of the Government in carrying out their promise given on the 17th November 1949 that this House would be consulted on the question of the proposed partition of the Province and the scant courtesy shown by the Government to this House in this all-important question affecting the welfare of this Province, the usefulness and very existence of this House by arriving at decisions and submitting a report to the Central Government